

United States Patent and Trademark Office

V)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/604,202	07/01/2003	Nobuo Okazaki	JP920020114	1201
32074 7	7590 07/13/2004		EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION DEPT. 18G BLDG. 300-482 2070 ROUTE 52 HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533			GURZO, PAUL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2881	
			DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/604,202	OKAZAKI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Paul Gurzo	2881			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	appears on the cover she t with the	correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•	•			
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	his action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims		,			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Exami The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 July 2003</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre The oath or declaration is objected to by the	a) accepted or b) objected to he drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applicate in a policate in a poli	ion No ed in this National Stage			
2) Notice 3) Information	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal (6) Other:	· ·			

Application/Control Number: 10/604,202

Art Unit: 2881

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps.

See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: a generation of the ion beams and a directing of the ion beam to the film on the substrate. These steps are crucial to the formation of an alignment layer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Sakakibara et al. (5,952,155).

Regarding claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, and 14, the admitted prior art teaches an apparatus and method for forming an alignment layer on a substrate of a liquid crystal display comprising an ion source for generating ion beams (28), a mask (20) having a slit (22) provided between the substrate and the ion source, and the ion source having a plate-like object (11c) with a plurality of ion ejection holes (30) (paragraph 0005-0007 and Fig. 5(a), 5(b), and 6). It does not explicitly teach that the holes are of various sizes. However, 155 teaches a plate capable of limiting the

Page 3

Art Unit: 2881

current amount of the beam passing through the apertures (col. 5, lines 12-28). They go on to teach that it is known in the prior art that a block (aperture) size can be made smaller when a pattern density is high and can be made larger when the pattern density is small (col. 3, lines 35-41), thus teaching on the claimed ion ejection holes of various sizes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use different ejection hole sizes so that the current amount (and therefore density) can be controlled to ensure proper alignment and application of the ion beams.

Regarding claims 4 and 10, it is obvious that the plate-like object can have areas of different and uniform sizes because 155 teaches that the plate can have hole sizes that are both large and/or small as stated above.

Regarding claims 5 and 11, Fig. 6 explicitly depicts the claimed parallel arrangement, and it is obvious that the holes of differing size as taught by 155 can also be arranged in such a manner to optimize the current control.

Regarding claims 6 and 12, the admitted prior art teaches a stage for moving the substrate (paragraph 0005).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Suguro et al. (6,614,033)

de Jager et al. (6,633,366)

Tanaka (6,720,680)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Gurzo whose telephone number is (571) 272-2472. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri. 7:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Lee can be reached at (571) 272-2477. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

PMG June 29, 2004

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800